

# United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/029,580	12/20/2001	Jason F. Hunzinger	09752-147001	4973	
27572	7590 05/03/2006		EXAM	EXAMINER	
HARNESS,	DICKEY & PIERCE,	FERGUSON, KEITH			
P.O. BOX 823	8 LD HILLS, MI 48303		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
BEOOMITEE	7 IIIDDS, 1411 40303		2617		
			DATE MAILED: 05/03/200	6	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Applic	ation No.	Applicant(s)		
Office Action Summary		9,580	HUNZINGER, JAS	SON F.	
		ner	Art Unit		
	Keith T	. Ferguson	2617		
The MAILING DATE of this com Period for Reply			ith the correspondence ad	dress	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIC WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM TH  - Extensions of time may be available under the prov after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maxim  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for Any reply received by the Office later than three more armed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704	IE MAILING DATE OF isions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no communication. um statutory period will apply an reply will, by statute, cause the nths after the mailing date of this	THIS COMMUNI be event, however, may a d will expire SIX (6) MOI application to become A	ICATION. reply be timely filed  NTHS from the mailing date of this co BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status					
<ol> <li>Responsive to communication(s</li> <li>This action is FINAL.</li> <li>Since this application is in condiction closed in accordance with the p</li> </ol>	2b)⊠ This action is tion for allowance exce	s non-final. ept for formal mat	· •	e merits is	
Disposition of Claims					
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-57</u> is/are pending in ( 4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>11-20</u> 5)□ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-10,21-30 and 52-57</u> i 7)□ Claim(s) is/are objected t 8)□ Claim(s) are subject to re	and 30-51 is/are withdo s/are rejected. o.		eration.		
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to be 10) The drawing(s) filed on is.  Applicant may not request that any Replacement drawing sheet(s) including The oath or declaration is object.	· /are: a)☐ accepted or objection to the drawing(s iding the correction is req	s) be held in abeya uired if the drawing	ince. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). g(s) is objected to. See 37 CF		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>					
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Reviews  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-144)		Paper No(	Summary (PTO-413) (s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application (PTC	D-152)	
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	10 01.1 1 0/00/00)	6)  Other:		<b>-</b> /	

Application/Control Number: 10/029,580 Page 2

Art Unit: 2617

#### DETAILED ACTION

1. The Art Unit location of your application in the USPTO has changed. To aid in correlating any papers for this application, all further correspondence regarding this application should be directed to Art Unit 2617.

### Response to Amendment

2. Applicant's request for reconsideration of the finality of the rejection of the last Office action is persuasive and, therefore, the finality of that action is withdrawn.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 1-4,10,21-24,30 and 52-57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fattouche in view of Watanabe, newly recited reference.

Regarding claims 1,2,10,21,22,30,52-54, and 55-57, Fattouche discloses a method (fig. 10) tracking earliest pilot phase offsets for geo-location determination (col. 34 line 25 through col. 35 line 22) comprising: determining with a cellular telephone (CT), search window limitations for one or more base station sectors (base station pilots) (col. 34 line 25 through col. 35 line 22); and searching for earliest pilot phase offsets

Art Unit: 2617

of the sectors using the determined search window (col. 34 line 25 through col. 35 line 22). Fattouche further discloses using results of phase measurement in position location algorithms (TOA or TDOA) (abstract and col. 34 line 25 through col. 35 line 22), and one or more base stations (201), serving a cell divided into one or more sectors (fig. 2). Fattouche differs from claims 1 and 21 of the present invention in that it does not disclose determining a search window limitations for one or more sectors due to mobile station dynamics. Watanabe teaches a system wherein a mobile station sets a search time for a search for each base station base upon the speed of the mobile station (col. 1 lines 57-67 and col. 6 lines 11-20). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made To modify Fattouche with determining a search window limitations for one or more sectors due to mobile station dynamics in order the system to allow the receiver to perform a high speed search based upon its speed when determining its position close to a nearby base station which is best for the receiver to communicate with, as taught by Watanabe.

Regarding claims 3,4,23 and 24, Fattouche discloses speed base factor (col. 31 lines 33-47).

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Application/Control Number: 10/029,580

Art Unit: 2617

6. Claims 5-7 and 25-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fattouche in view of Watanabe as applied to claims 1 and 21 above and in further view of Kim et al..

Regarding claims 5 and 25, the combination of Fattouche and Watanabe differs from claims 5 and 25 of the present invention in that they do not disclose setting the search window size asymmetrically from an early and a late side. Kim et al. teaches a tracking circuit within a mobile telephone for setting the search window size asymmetrically from an early and a late side for tracking a received communication signal (col. 1 lines 6-12, col. 2 lines 15-35 and fig. 4). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify combination of Fattouche and Watanabe with setting the search window size asymmetrically from an early and a late side in order for the wireless system to provide signals to the cellular telephone so that the cellular telephone can determine its position, as taught by Kim et al..

Regarding claims 6,7,26 and 27, combination of Fattouche and Watanabe differs from claims 6,7,26 and 27 of the present invention in that they do not disclose setting an early side of the search window based on cell size and speed of a mobile station and setting a later side of the search window based on a speed of a mobile station. Kim et al. teaches system wherein a tracking circuit within a mobile telephone for setting the search window size asymmetrically from an early and a late side for tracking a received communication signal (col. 1 lines 6-12, col. 2 lines 15-35 and fig. 4), setting an early side of the search window based on cell size (signal to noise ratio by M) and speed (velocity) of a mobile station (M)(col. 3 lines 14-56 and col. 5 line 54 through col. 6 line 63), and setting a later side of the search window based on a speed (velocity) of a mobile station) (col. 3 lines 14-56 and col. 5 line 54 through col. 6 line 63). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify combination of Fattouche and Watanabe with setting an early side of the search window based on cell size and speed of a mobile station and setting a later side of the search window based on a speed of a mobile station in order for the system to communicate with the cellular telephone and for the cellular telephone to determine its location base on the speed of the

Application/Control Number: 10/029,580

Art Unit: 2617

cellular telephone and the time of arrival of pilot offsets of nearby base station, as taught by Kim et al..

7. Claims 8,9,28 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fattouche in view of Watanabe as applied to claims 1 and 21 above and in further view of Leblanc et al..

Regarding claims 8,9,28 and 29, combination of Fattouche and Watanabe differs from claims 8,9,28 and 29 of the present invention in that they do not disclose transmitting cell size based limitations in a overhead to a mobile station. Leblanc et al. teaches transmitting cell size based limitations in a overhead message (delay elements which contain omnicell sizes and radius) to a mobile station (col. 24 lines 54-67 and col. 35 line 11 through col. 36 line 34). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide combination of Fattouche and Watanabe with transmitting cell size based limitations in a overhead to a mobile station in order for the system to provide the cellular telephone nearby base station pilot signals so that the cellular telephone could determine its position, as taught by Leblanc et al..

### Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Keith T. Ferguson whose telephone number is (571) 272-7865. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30am-4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Trost can be reached on (571) 272-7872. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/029,580

Art Unit: 2617

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

Page 6

information for unpublished applications is available through

Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system,

see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on

access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Keith Ferguson Art Unit 2617 April 27, 2006

KEITH PERGUSON PREMARY EXAMINEP